

# BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING LAW CORPORATIONS

Telephone (408) 720-8300

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW  
SILICON VALLEY

OTHER OFFICES

Facsimile (408) 720-8383

1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY  
SUNNYVALE, CALIFORNIA 94085-4040

LOS ANGELES, CA

COSTA MESA / ORANGE COUNTY, CA

PORTLAND / BEAVERTON, OR

SEATTLE, WA

DENVER, CO

RECEIVED

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 14 2008

## FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

Deliver to:	Brian T. O'Connor, USPTO	Art Group:	2619
Facsimile No.:	571-273-8300	Date:	May 14, 2008
From:	Matthew W. Hindman, Reg. No. 57,396		
Our Docket No.:	4906.P148	No. of pages including this sheet: 4	
Application No.:	10/682,514	Filing Date:	Docket Due
		October 8, 2003	Date(s): 7/15/2008

Enclosed are the following documents:

<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment: _____ pgs	<input type="checkbox"/> Issue Fee Transmittal
<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Brief (in triplicate) _____ pgs	<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Appeal
<input type="checkbox"/> Application: _____ pgs w/ cover & abstract	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition for:
<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment & Cover Sheet ( _____ pgs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Continued Examination
<input type="checkbox"/> Certificate of Declaration & POA ( _____ pgs)	<input type="checkbox"/> (RCE)
<input type="checkbox"/> Drawings: _____ sheets, _____ figures	<input type="checkbox"/> Reply Brief ( _____ pgs)
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time:	<input type="checkbox"/> Request & Certification Under 35 USC
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal (in duplicate)	<input type="checkbox"/> 122(b)(2)(B)(i)
IDS & PTO/SB/08 ( _____ pgs)	<input type="checkbox"/> Request to Rescind Previous
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Nonpublication Request
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Response to Written Opinion ( _____ pgs)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Transmittal of Publication Fee Due
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Proposed Agenda for Interview (3 pages)	<input type="checkbox"/> Transmittal Letter

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.



Alma Goldchain 5/14/08  
Date

Confidentiality Note: The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain information from the law firm of Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman which is confidential or privileged. The information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the original documents at no cost to you.

If you do not receive all the pages, or if there is any difficulty in receiving, please call: (408) 720-8300 and ask for Alma Goldchain

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Attorney Docket No. 4906.P148

MAY 14 2008

PATENT

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In Re Application of:**

Joel L. Wittenberg

Examiner: Brian T. O'Connor

Application No.: 10/682,514

Art Unit: 2619

Filed: October 8, 2003

Confirmation No.: 2947

For: **NETWORK ELEMENT HAVING A  
REDIRECT SERVER**

**Proposed Agenda for Interview**

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed April 15, 2008, applicant has scheduled an interview with Examiner Brian T. O'Connor at 1pm EST on May 19, 2008. Please consider the following proposed agenda.

**Proposed Agenda**

At this time, applicant is not proposing any amendments to the claims. Applicant believes there is some confusion as to the arguments in this case and proposes discussing the arguments telephonically for a clearer understanding of the positions held by the applicant and the examiner, respectively.

**Summary of applicant's argument**

Applicant believes there is some confusion with the arguments applicant presented in the last Office Action response. Specifically, applicant's argument is that the "in a single network element" limitation recited in applicant's independent claims requires that the receiving, examining, forwarding and redirecting each be performed within a single physical network element such as a bridge, switch, router, or other such devices as are known in the art. The rejection in the Office Action focused on the "remote client" limitation and argues that the plain meaning of the term "remote client" indicates that the remote client is not within the network element. However, this is not what applicant is arguing. Applicant notes that the term "remote client" indicates that the remote client is located outside the single network element. Applicant's argument is not that the "remote client" is within the same network element, but rather that each of the receiving, examining, forwarding and redirecting are performed within the same network element.

The cited reference, Watanabe, includes two separate network elements to provide the functionality recited in applicant's independent claims. That is, the Watanabe reference teaches two network elements to provide the receiving, examining, forwarding, and redirecting limitations recited in applicant's claims. As discussed in the Office Action, the "administration center" (Figure 8) receives the packets and examines a

set of rules (12 of Figure 8) to determine if the packet will be redirected to another network system's address, and then, if necessary, forwards the packet to the "transmit-packet processing unit" (41 of Figure 8) which redirects and forwards the packets to the remote client. It is clear, then, that two network elements in Watanabe perform the functionality recited in applicant's claims. For example, with reference to Watanabe's figure 1, the "administration center" (1 of Figure 1) and the "transmit-packet transfer processing unit" (41 of Figure's 1 and 8) are separated by an "external network" (2 of Figure 1), and must be, therefore, located within separate physical boxes.

Respectfully Submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: May 14, 2008

  
Matthew W. Hindman  
Attorney at Law  
Reg. No.: 57,396

1279 Oakmead Pkwy  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(408) 720-8300